UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,917	06/14/2001	Stephen P. Forte	T7093.0016/P016	5556

24998 7590 11/20/2007

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 EYE STREET NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403

EXAMINER	
PEREZ, ANGELICA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2618	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09879917	6/14/01	FORTE, STEPHEN P.	T7093.0016/P016

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 EYE STREET NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403

EXAMINER	
Perez M.. Angelica	
ART UNIT	**PAPER**
2618	20071010

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Please, find Examiner's Answer attached.

Angelica Perez

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/879,917
Filing Date: June 14, 2001
Appellant(s): FORTE, STEPHEN P.

Gianni Minutoli
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/10/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/01/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,978,672	HARTMAIER	11-1999
6,275,577	JACKSON	8-2001
6,771,761	LAPIERRE	8-2004
6,711,401 B1	CHOW	3-2004
2002/0013141 A1	COX	1-2002
5,884,191	KARPUS	3-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 10-13, 15-18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier (Hartmaier et al.; US Patent No.: 5,978,672 A) in view of Jackson (Jackson, Allen; US Patent No.: 6,275,577 B1) and further in view of LaPierre (LaPierre, Steven R.; US Patent no.: 6,771,761 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Hartmaier teaches of a telecommunication device, network, method and enterprise comprising (columns 1, 3 and 5; lines 5-7, 10-14 and 17-22; where the third set of lines teaches of a device): a telephony interface (column 8,

lines 65-67) the telephony interface for receiving a telephone call via a first communication path and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call (column 12, lines 37-40; where the telephone receiving the call represents and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call; column 12, lines 37-40; e.g., "call screening"), the telephony interface using the dialed telephone number to retrieve at least one wireless telephone number and at least one user preference from a storage medium (column 12, lines 20-25; where it is inherent in the art to retrieve the information that has been stored previously).

Hartmaier does not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths, and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user In related art, concerning call handling.

Jackson teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths (column 2, lines 3-28, figure 1, items 18 and 20 are connected by router 16 though separate wireless links), and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user (column 3, lines 12-24 and 55-58; where the user "authenticates" the call by accepting it after screening it).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with Jackson's route in the call to two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously in order to ensure that the called party can be reached, as taught by Jackson.

Hartmaier and Jackson do not specifically teach where the enterprise telecommunication network is solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art, concerning a system and method for caller-selectable call routing from a single telephone number, LaPierre teaches where the extensions of the enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices (column 3, lines 42-47; where the system can employ only wireless devices, and columns 1 and 2, lines 65-67 and 1-17, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's and Jackson's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with LaPierre's wireless PBX network in order to provide a universal number that can be linked to multiple destinations associated with one user, as taught by LaPierre.

Regarding claim 2, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where a first wireless destination telephone number corresponds to the retrieved wireless telephone number and a second wireless destination telephone number corresponds to a retrieved second wireless telephone number (column 12, lines 37-40).

Regarding claims 3 and 24, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claims 2 and 23, respectively. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to a voice mailbox telephone number (column 15, lines 65-67).

LaPierre further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third wireless destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 3, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's telephony interface route to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number and further with LaPierre's predetermined time in order to activate the messaging service after a certain elapsed time, as taught by LaPierre.

Regarding claim 5, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes a first and second calls to a first wireless destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and to a second wireless destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second wireless telephone number and as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 16, table 2; e.g., the table indicates in the upper 4 levels where the office phone is the prime number, the routing first preference is given to the office number followed. Similarly the bottom part provides the preference to the mobile phone according to the user preference).

Regarding claim 8, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a single destination telephone number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number (column 16, table 2; e.g., "office voice mail" is a single destination).

Regarding claim 10, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. In addition, Hartmaier where the telephony interface communicates with a private branch exchange, and where at least one of the at least one destination telephone numbers is associated with the private branch exchange (column 11, lines 60-63).

Regarding claim 11, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 10. Hartmaier also teaches where the at least one destination telephone number associated with the private branch exchange is associated with a cellular telephone (column 11, lines 60-63).

Regarding claim 12, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 11. Hartmaier also teaches where the cellular telephone can operate independently from the device (column 3, lines 42-55; where the inherent programmable flexibility of cellular phones allows for independent as well as joint operability with other systems).

Regarding claim 13, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 11. Also, Hartmaier teaches where another of the at least two wireless destination telephone numbers is associated with a pager (column 12, lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 15, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface receives the call from a public switched telephone network, and where at least one of the at least one wireless destination telephone number is associated with a private branch exchange (columns 1,2 and 10; lines 16-21, 14-16 and 39-42 respectively; e.g., PSTN and column 9, lines 5-7; where the PBX is the destination number).

Regarding claim 16, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 15. Hartmaier further teaches where the at least one wireless destination telephone number associated with the private branch exchange is associated with a cellular telephone (column 12, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 17, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Also, Hartmaier teaches where the telephony interface is connected to a local area network and the at least one user preference is input via the local area network (column 1, lines 5-7).

Regarding claim 18, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface is connected to the Internet and the at least one user preference is input via the Internet (column 9, lines 38-44).

3. Claims 4, 6-7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre and further in view of Chow (Chow et al., US Patent No.: 6,711,401 B1).

Regarding claim 4, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 3.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where the predetermined time corresponds to a number of telephone rings defined by the at least one retrieved user preference.

In related art concerning a wireless centrex call return Chow teaches where the predetermined time corresponds to a number of telephone rings defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 6, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's telephony interface with Chow's predefined number of telephone rings as one of a number of modes that the user can select, as taught by Chow.

Regarding claim 6, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 5.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where the at least one retrieved user preference defines a first ring count for the call to the first wireless destination telephone number and a second different ring count for the call to the second wireless destination telephone number.

Chow teaches where the at least one retrieved user preference defines a first ring count for the call to the first wireless destination telephone number and a second different ring count for the call to the second wireless destination telephone number

(column 75, lines 5-14; e.g., ring type 1, ring type 2 and ring type; where the ringer can be programmed according to the user's preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's telephony interface with Chow's different ring counts in order to be able to identify the type of call being received, as taught by Chow.

Regarding claim 7, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Chow teach all the limitations of claim 6. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third wireless destination telephone number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after the telephony interface rings the first wireless destination number more than the first ring count (column 16, table 2; e.g., Idle and inactive in column 3 routed to office voice mail).

Regarding claim 14, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 10.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where one of at least two wireless destination telephone number is associated with a personal digital assistant.

Chow teaches where another of the at least one wireless destination telephone number is associated with a personal digital assistant (column 80, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's telephony

interface with Chow's personal digital assistant as an option of a number of wireless devices.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre and further in view of Cox (Cox et al.; US Pub. No.: 2002/0,013,141 A1).

Regarding claim 9, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where the telephony interface prompts a caller of the telephone call with a menu of call destination options and the telephony interface places the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers in accordance with an option selected by the caller.

In related art concerning a method and system for personalized information services, Cox teaches where the telephony interface prompts a caller of the telephone call with a menu of call destination options and the telephony interface places the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers in accordance with an option selected by the caller (page 6, paragraphs 99-110; where the options can be customized according to the user's preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's combined telecommunications network with Cox's menu in order to provide the caller with alternative routes of his/her preference.

5. Claims 19-23, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre in view of Karpus (Karpus et al.; US Patent No.: 5,884,191).

Regarding claims 19 and 29, Hartmaier teaches of a telecommunication device, network, method and enterprise comprising (columns 1, 3 and 5; lines 5-7, 10-14 and 17-22; where the third set of lines teaches of a device): a telephony interface (column 8, lines 65-67) the telephony interface for receiving a telephone call via a first communication path and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call (column 12, lines 37-40; where the telephone receiving the call represents and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call; column 12, lines 37-40; e.g., "call screening"), the telephony interface using the identified dialed telephone number to retrieve a first enterprise extension telephone number associated with the wireless telephone and to retrieve at least one user preference from a storage medium (column 12, lines 20-25; where it is inherent in the art to retrieve the information that has been stored previously), the telephony enterprise determining user access rights based on at least one enterprise preference associated with first enterprise extension telephone number (column 12, lines 10-56, where during the screening, telephone related to the user are compared and access rights are determined).

Hartmaier does not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths, and, the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or

third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user.

In related art, concerning call handling, Jackson teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths (column 2, lines 3-28, figure 1, items 18 and 20 are connected by router 16 though separate wireless links), and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user (column 3, lines 12-24 and 55-58; where the user "authenticates" the call by accepting it after screening it).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with Jackson's route in the call to two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously in order to ensure that the called party can be reached, as taught by Jackson.

Hartmaier and Jackson do not specifically teach where the enterprise telecommunication network is solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art, concerning a system and method for caller-selectable call routing from a single telephone number, LaPierre teaches where the extensions of the enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices (column 3, lines 42-47; where the system can employ only wireless devices, and columns 1 and 2, lines 65-67 and 1-17, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's and Jackson's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with LaPierre's wireless PBX network in order to provide a universal number that can be linked to multiple destinations associated with one user, as taught by LaPierre.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach of generating and sending the simulated dial tone to the wireless telephone to provide access to the enterprise communications network based on the at least one user preference and at least one enterprise preference associated with the enterprise telephone number; and where the extensions of the enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art concerning interface systems for a mobile office environment, Karpus teaches of generating and sending the simulated dial tone to the wireless telephone to provide access to the enterprise communications network based on the at least one user preference and at least one enterprise preference associated with the enterprise telephone number (column 4, lines 49-54; where the preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier's, Jackson's and LaPierre's method of providing access to an enterprise telecommunication network with Kraus's simulated dial tone in order to provide access notification to a cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 20, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teaches where the at least one enterprise

preference comprises a security group defining authorized outbound call access of a user of the wireless telephone (column 14, lines 58-65).

Regarding claim 21, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teaches where the at least one user preference comprises a dial tone timeout period, where the user of the wireless telephone is prevented from placing a call after the dial tone timeout expires (column 12, line 10-14; where it is known in the art that a phone call can not be placed after a dial tone expires).

Regarding claim 22, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface further comprises: means for receiving a second telephone call, the second telephone call being placed to the first enterprise extension telephone number; means for identifying the first enterprise extension telephone number from the second call; means for using the first enterprise extension telephone number to retrieve at least the wireless telephone number; and means for using the at least one user preference to route the second call via a second communication path to at least one destination telephone number, where the at least one destination telephone number is selected from the group consisting of the wireless telephone number and a voice mailbox telephone number (column 16, lines 10; where when the telephone is “busy and active”, a phone call being held, a second call is routed to the “office voice mail". Also, where the “enterprise” corresponds to the office network. Moreover, a second call can be received after a first call; therefore, the procedure is the same as that of the first call).

Regarding claim 23, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 22. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to two destination telephone numbers simultaneously, a first destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and a second destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second telephone number (column 16, table 2, columns 1 and 2 in the table indicate the office phone and mobile phone as the receivers of the call at the same time).

Regarding claim 25, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 22. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes a first and second calls to a first destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and to a second destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second telephone number in a sequential manner and as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 16, table 2; e.g., the table indicates in the upper 4 levels where the office phone is the prime number, the routing first preference is given to the office number followed. Similarly the bottom part provides the preference to the mobile phone according to the user preference).

6. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier in view of Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus and further in view of Chow.

Regarding claim 24, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 23. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number.

Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus do not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference.

In related art concerning a wireless centre call return, Chow teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 6, lines 35-40; where the "selected" time periods correspond to the user preferences).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus' telephony interface routes to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number with Chow's predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference in order to activate the messaging service after a certain elapsed time, as taught by Chow.

(10) Response to Arguments

In the remarks the Appellant argues in substance:

(A) In pages 14-17, the appellant argues, "Claim 1 recites...", "Hartmaier fails to teach or suggest a telecommunication device comprising "[a] telephony interface for receiving a telephone call via a first communication path,.., identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call, [and] using the dialed telephone number to retrieve.., at least one user preference... to route the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via a second and third communication path."..."Further, Hartmaier fails to teach or suggest the "telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting [the] first communication path to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user."...Jackson fails to teach or suggest these limitations..."

In response to argument (A), the examiner would like to indicate that in column 2, Jackson teaches where "an incoming call...rout[ed] by router 16 to the called party who has several telephone numbers, each associated with a different device. The devices to which an incoming call may be routed by router 16 include wireless telephone 18, pager 20..." (See lines 3-10); "If the received call is to be routed to the wireless phone and pager, router 16 provides the received call in parallel paths to wireless phone 18 and pager 20 so that the received call is immediately available for connection by either." (See lines 25-28).

The call is routed to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers (pager and wireless phone numbers) substantially simultaneously (in parallel), via respective

second or third communication path (where the telephone and pager have respective communications paths that run parallel to each other), when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user, where when the user answer the call (an acknowledgment message is automatically sent back, as known in the art. In addition, when the user accepts the call, after reading at least the page, he/she is authenticating the call).

Although the appellant argues that it is a request and not an actual "call" being routed to the pager, Jackson explicitly states a call being routed to the pager. If the appellant wishes to further define the claimed "call" to differentiate it from the "call" of Jackson, then an amendment to the claims may be necessary.

(B) In page 16, the Appellant further argues, "In Jackson, however, the incoming call is not forwarded to and cannot be answered by the user at the pager 20; instead, the pager 20 only receives a page (via the request). Hence, Jackson cannot connect the incoming call to the pager's communication path. This is entirely different than the claim 1 invention, which recites that the "call" is routed to "at least two wireless destination telephone numbers.., via respective second and third communication paths." The Jackson page request is not a call. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the "call" is connected to the user "by connecting said first communication path to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user." The Jackson pager 20 serves only a notifying function that alerts the called party that he has a call at the wireless phone 18. A call is not sent to the Jackson pager 20, nor can a call be answered at the Jackson pager 20.

In response to argument (B), the examiner would like to point out that an incoming call is forwarded (routed) to the pager, as indicated in column 2, lines 25-28 and 60-63, and can be answered by a pager as it is know in the art of bidirectional pagers. In addition, the claim does not claim where the call is actually answered, it claims where the call is connected instead.

With respect to Jackson's page not being a call, the examiner would like to indicate that a call is received and routed to different devices comprising respective telephone numbers, where the pager has its own number and where a call is routed to the pager as indicated in column 2, lines 25-58).

Regarding the argument where the call is not sent to the Jackson pager 20, nor the call be answered at the Jackson pager 20, the examiner would like to indicate that the claim reads, "routing the call to at least two wireless destinations telephone numbers...connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication path to the second or third communication path....."; here we can see that the call can be routed to two destination telephone numbers as previously indicated (wireless phone and pager) and the call is ultimately connected (not actually answered, where information can be received only in one direction as it is done with certain types of answering machines as well as with unidirectional pagers) to a user by connecting to a second or third communication path (where the communication is connected to a wireless phone or a pager), given *arguendo*.

(C) In page 18, the Appellant argues, "Claim 19 recites", "it would not have been obvious...to combine the teachings of the cited prior art...",

In response to argument (C), the examiner would like to explain where the prior art, in its very basics, deals with routing of telephone calls to different devices related to an individual/organization in order to make it easier for a caller to reach a callee.

(D) In page 18, the Appellant argues, Even if relevant, which Appellant does not concede, Karpus does not teach or suggest "determining access rights for a user of the wireless telephone and if the user has rights to access the enterprise telecommunication network, generating and sending a simulated dial tone to the wireless telephone and providing access to [an] enterprise telecommunication network.., that consist solely of wireless devices." Karpus is concerned with granting the accessory devices (e.g., speakerphone 170, handset 180, modem 190) access rights to the audio channel of the cellular telephone 110. When the rights are granted, the system 100 communicates the grant to the accessories, not the cellular telephone 110."

In response to argument (D), the examiner would like to explain where the appellant does not claims a "cellular phone", the appellant claims a "wireless telephone". Thus, the examiner would like to clarify that a "wireless telephone" includes "cordless telephones", "handsets" and "cellular telephones" among others. Given this clarification, the dial tone as stated in column 4, lines 45-57 of the Karpus's reference, the "simulated dial tone" is provided to at least "radiotelephone handset 180" (See column 3, lines 50-52). In addition, in order for a device to be granted access to the system for communications, the device is pooled to determine if it has rights to access the system (See column 4, lines 22-34).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejection should be sustained.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Respectfully submitted

Work Group 2618

October 10, 2007

Conferees:

Matthew D. Anderson (Supervisory Patent Examiner)

Edward Urban (Supervisory Patent Examiner)

Angelica M. Perez (Examiner)

MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Gianni Minutoli

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Day : Tuesday
Date: 06-Nov-2007
Time: 10:55

SIRDEV MIS INTRANET

APPEAL CENTER RETURN

Application Number:	09879917	Date:	06-Nov-2007
Examiner:	ANGELICA, PEREZ	GAU:	2618

Appeal Document(s) that caused this Return -- *Please check at least one Document type:*

- ☑ Examiner's Answer
- ☐ Amendments not entered/considered
- ☐ Supplemental Examiner's Answer
- ☐ Affidavits, Declarations, Evidence
- ☐ IDS
- ☐ Artifacts
- ☐ Translation of foreign references needed
- ☐ Other

Reason for Return (from Appeal Specialist to Examiner) -- *Please check at least one Message box o. enter text:*

- ☐ No Appeal Conference Held
- ☐ Conference initials needed (three)
- ☐ Headings
- ☐ New Ground of Rejection - TC Director signature needed

(256 characters max)

The coversheet has the incorrect dates for Brief 7/10/07 and Office Action 12/01/06. Please correct using a PTOL-90. Thanks, Bridget 2-1651

Print this Form | Send to Examiner

To go back use Back button on your browser toolbar.

Back to PALM | ASSIGNMENT | OASIS Home page